

Remarks

Claims 5-6, 10-11, 18, 20 and 23 are pending and rejected.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 12, 14, 16, 17 and 22 are allowed.

Claims 5, 18, 20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linder et al. (2002/0194385 A1, hereinafter Linder) in view of Michaelis et al. (US 2004/0009751 A1, hereinafter Michaelis) and further in view of Dharmadhikari et al. (US 2003/0065816 A1, hereinafter Dharmadhikari)

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linder in view of Michaelis in view of Dharmadhikari and further in view of Ayyagari et al. (US 2002/0176366, hereinafter Ayyagari).

Claims 6, 8 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants note that in the Office Action Summary, claim 8 is listed as being both rejected and objected to, however, in the Detailed Action the Examiner does not recite any rejection of claim 8 and states that claim 8 is objected to and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of base claim 5 from which claim 8 depends. Thus, Appellant submits that claim 8 is objected to and not rejected.

Each of the various rejections and objections are overcome by amendments that are made to the specification, drawing, and/or claims, as well as, or in the alternative, by various arguments that are presented.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 CFR 1.116 since the amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) does not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; (c) satisfies a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) does not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; or (e) places the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented because it is made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendment is thus respectfully requested.

Any amendments to any claim for reasons other than as expressly recited herein as being for the purpose of distinguishing such claim from known prior art are not being made with an intent to change in any way the literal scope of such claims or the range of equivalents for such claims. They are being made simply to present language that is better in conformance with the form requirements of Title 35 of the United States Code or is simply clearer and easier to understand than the originally presented language. Any amendments to any claim expressly made in order to distinguish such claim from known prior art are being made only with an intent to change the literal scope of such claim in the most minimal way, i.e., to just avoid the prior art in a way that leaves the claim novel and not obvious in view of the cited prior art, and no equivalent of any subject matter remaining in the claim is intended to be surrendered.

Also, since a dependent claim inherently includes the recitations of the claim or chain of claims from which it depends, it is submitted that the scope and content of any dependent claims that have been herein rewritten in independent form is exactly the same as the scope and content of those claims prior to having been rewritten in independent form. That is, although by convention such rewritten claims are labeled herein as having been "amended," it is submitted that only the format, and not the content, of these claims has been changed. This is true whether a dependent claim has been rewritten to expressly include the limitations of those claims on which it formerly depended or whether an independent claim has been rewritten to include the limitations of claims that previously depended from it. Thus, by such rewriting no equivalent of any subject matter of the original dependent claim is intended to be surrendered. If the Examiner is of a different view, he is respectfully requested to so indicate.

Claim Amendments

Applicants have herein amended claims 6, 8, and 11 to include the limitations of claim 5. Applicants have herein cancelled claims 5 and 10.

Applicants have herein cancelled claims 18 and 20, where claim 18 claimed a mobile node similar in scope to the method of claim 5. Applicants have herein added new claims 27, 28, and 29, which claim mobile nodes similar in scope to the methods of claims 6, 8, and 11.

Applicants have herein cancelled claim 23, which recited a computer readable medium similar in scope to the method of claim 5. Applicants have herein added new claims 30, 31, and 32, which claim computer readable storage mediums that are similar in scope to the methods of claims 6, 8, and 11.

Applicants have herein cancelled withdrawn claims 13, 21, and 24-26.

Applicants submit that no new matter has been entered.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 5, 18, 20 and 23

Claims 5, 18, 20, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linder in view of Michaelis and further in view of Dharmadhikari. The rejection is traversed.

Applicants have herein cancelled claims 5, 18, 20, and 23. Thus, this rejection is moot.

Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 10

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linder in view of Michaelis in view of Dharmadhikari and further in view of Ayyagari. The rejection is traversed.

Applicants have herein cancelled claim 10. Thus, this rejection is moot.

Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for the allowance of claims 1, 3, 4, 12, 14, 16, 17 and 22.

Claims 6, 8 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 6, 8, and 11 have been rewritten in independent form and, thus, are allowable over the cited references. Therefore, the objection should be withdrawn.

Applicants have added new claims 27, 28, and 29, which claim mobile nodes similar in scope to the methods of claims 6, 8, and 11, respectively, and, therefore, are allowable at least for the same reasons for which claims 6, 8, and 11 are allowable.

Applicants have added new claims 30, 31, and 32, which claim computer readable storage mediums similar in scope to the methods of claims 6, 8, and 11, respectively, and, therefore, are allowable at least for the same reasons for which claims 6, 8, and 11 are allowable.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims pending in the application are allowable.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner still believes that there are unresolved issues, the Examiner is invited to call Eamon Wall at (732) 842-8110 x120 so that arrangements may be made to discuss and resolve any such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _____

4/30/09



Eamon J. Wall
Registration No. 39,414
Attorney for Applicants

WALL & TONG, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702
Telephone: 732-842-8110
Facsimile: 732-842-8388